

Remarks

This is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 6, 2003.

The claims have been discussed by telephone interview with Examiner Lesperance, who reported on Wednesday, November 12, 2003, that he and his Supervisory Primary Examiner, Richard Hjerpe, agree that all claims presented herein are patentable over the art of record and that subject to updating of the search the patent application would be allowed.

The courtesy of Examiners Lesperance and Hjerpe in conducting the telephone interviews is noted with appreciation.

The application includes claims 1-36, 38, 39, 45-48, 51, and 53-77.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 11, 16, 17, 24, 28, 30, 31, 33, 34, 45-47, 51, and 54 have been amended herein.

Claims 55-77 have been added herein.

Claims 37, 38, 41-44, 49, 50, 52 have been canceled. Such cancellation has been made without prejudice.

Moreover, the amendments to a number of the claims herein are made in the interest of expediting issuance of a patent. Such amendments are made without prejudice.

The following claims were rejected in view of U.S. Patent # 6,593,957 ("Christie")—Claims 1-10, 12, 13, 15-23, 27, 28, 31-36, 39, 40, 43-54; the following claims were rejected in view of Christie in view of U.S. Patent # 5,421,589 ("Monroe")—Claims 11, 14 and 29; the following claims were rejected in view of Christie in view of U.S. Patent # 5,976,017 ("Omori et al.")—Claims 24-26. Also, claim 30 was rejected in view of U.S. Patent # 5,967,017 ("Omorie et al.").


Withdrawal of all rejections respectfully is requested. A number of distinctions of the claims over the prior art were discussed by telephone interview, and the Examiner agreed that all claims are allowable subject to updating the search. The present invention provides for viewing of images, e.g., left eye and right eye images that are a stereo pair, on respective displays such that the images can be discriminated based on

E

polarization. Christie is directed to an auto-stereoscopic display system. Light is directed along two different light paths to the eyes of a viewer and is not discriminated by polarization. In the present invention a beam splitter is used to rotate the polarization direction of linear polarized light or to rotate or change the sense of circular polarized light; there is no such rotation disclosed in Christie or in the other references that were combined with Christie. For example, a number of the new claims, for example, claims 59, 64 and 70, are directed to circular polarization features of the invention, which the Examiner agreed such new claims also are allowable. Various other features of the claims further distinguish the invention over the references. The secondary references do not make up for the deficiencies in Christie, as the Examiner agreed. Also, as the Examiner agreed, the subject matter of claim 30 is not disclosed by Omorie et al. In view of the agreement reached, all claims now are allowable, and it is respectfully requested that a notice of allowance be issued as promptly as possible.

A transmittal sheet is provided herewith to charge the additional filing fee for 14 total additional claims and 1 additional independent claim not previously paid for. If any additional fee is required, please charge the fee to applicant's attorney's deposit account as indicated at the beginning of this Reply.

Respectfully submitted,
Renner, Otto, Boisselle & Sklar, LLP.


Warren A. Sklar, Reg. No. 26,373

19th Floor
1621 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115
Tel: 216 621 1113
Fax: 216 621 6165

Z:\SEC113\WASIVE\IAP103usa\Amdt_Nov 13 2003\Amd_5_Fnl.doc

E